



# UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
www.uspto.gov

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
09/705,486	11/03/2000	Joseph Gendler	P/2167-166	7644

7590 06/21/2004

Edward A. Meilman, Esq.  
Dickstein Shapiro Morin & Oshinsky LLP  
1177 Avenue of the Americas - 41 st Floor  
New York,, NY 10036-2714

EXAMINER
----------

SHAFFER, ERIC T

ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER
----------	--------------

3623

DATE MAILED: 06/21/2004

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

**Advisory Action**

Application No.

09/705,486

Applicant(s)

GENDLER, JOSEPH

Examiner

Eric T. Shaffer

Art Unit

3623

--The MAILING DATE of this communication appears on the cover sheet with the correspondence address --

THE REPLY FILED 21 May 2004 FAILS TO PLACE THIS APPLICATION IN CONDITION FOR ALLOWANCE. Therefore, further action by the applicant is required to avoid abandonment of this application. A proper reply to a final rejection under 37 CFR 1.113 may only be either: (1) a timely filed amendment which places the application in condition for allowance; (2) a timely filed Notice of Appeal (with appeal fee); or (3) a timely filed Request for Continued Examination (RCE) in compliance with 37 CFR 1.114.

**PERIOD FOR REPLY** [check either a) or b)]

- a) ☒ The period for reply expires 3 months from the mailing date of the final rejection.
- b) ☐ The period for reply expires on: (1) the mailing date of this Advisory Action, or (2) the date set forth in the final rejection, whichever is later. In no event, however, will the statutory period for reply expire later than SIX MONTHS from the mailing date of the final rejection. ONLY CHECK THIS BOX WHEN THE FIRST REPLY WAS FILED WITHIN TWO MONTHS OF THE FINAL REJECTION. See MPEP 706.07(f).

Extensions of time may be obtained under 37 CFR 1.136(a). The date on which the petition under 37 CFR 1.136(a) and the appropriate extension fee have been filed is the date for purposes of determining the period of extension and the corresponding amount of the fee. The appropriate extension fee under 37 CFR 1.17(a) is calculated from: (1) the expiration date of the shortened statutory period for reply originally set in the final Office action; or (2) as set forth in (b) above, if checked. Any reply received by the Office later than three months after the mailing date of the final rejection, even if timely filed, may reduce any earned patent term adjustment. See 37 CFR 1.704(b).

1. ☐ A Notice of Appeal was filed on \_\_\_\_\_. Appellant's Brief must be filed within the period set forth in 37 CFR 1.192(a), or any extension thereof (37 CFR 1.191(d)), to avoid dismissal of the appeal.
2. ☐ The proposed amendment(s) will not be entered because:
- (a) ☐ they raise new issues that would require further consideration and/or search (see NOTE below);
- (b) ☐ they raise the issue of new matter (see Note below);
- (c) ☐ they are not deemed to place the application in better form for appeal by materially reducing or simplifying the issues for appeal; and/or
- (d) ☐ they present additional claims without canceling a corresponding number of finally rejected claims.

NOTE: \_\_\_\_\_

3. ☐ Applicant's reply has overcome the following rejection(s): \_\_\_\_\_.
4. ☐ Newly proposed or amended claim(s) \_\_\_\_\_ would be allowable if submitted in a separate, timely filed amendment canceling the non-allowable claim(s).
5. ☒ The a) ☐ affidavit, b) ☐ exhibit, or c) ☒ request for reconsideration has been considered but does NOT place the application in condition for allowance because: See Continuation Sheet.
6. ☐ The affidavit or exhibit will NOT be considered because it is not directed SOLELY to issues which were newly raised by the Examiner in the final rejection.
7. ☒ For purposes of Appeal, the proposed amendment(s) a) ☐ will not be entered or b) ☒ will be entered and an explanation of how the new or amended claims would be rejected is provided below or appended.

The status of the claim(s) is (or will be) as follows:

Claim(s) allowed: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) objected to: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) rejected: 1-67.

Claim(s) withdrawn from consideration: \_\_\_\_\_.

8. ☐ The drawing correction filed on \_\_\_\_\_ is a) ☐ approved or b) ☐ disapproved by the Examiner.
9. ☐ Note the attached Information Disclosure Statement(s) (PTO-1449) Paper No(s). \_\_\_\_\_.
10. ☐ Other: \_\_\_\_\_

  
TARIQ R. HAFIZ  
SUPERVISORY PATENT EXAMINER  
TECHNOLOGY CENTER 3600

Applicant argues that Mora et al does not teach automatic forwarding the notice requesting a signature for persons in an approval hierarchy. However, Mora teaches "automated and controlled signature form for required signoff", (column 21, lines 17 -18) where the signoff document is forwarded, "the notebook process creates a Signature Request document that is sent to the required signatories. The Signature Request document prompts the signatories to review and approve the associated document" (column 7, lines 48 - 52). An automated signature form is automatic and sending someone a document to be signed is in fact forwarding.

Applicant argues that Mora does not teach an approval hierarchy. However, in figure 3, Mora teaches high-level documents, division-level documents and assignments, wherein highlevel and division-level are multiple levels. Mora also teaches getting an approval signature on documents (column 7, lines 48 - 52). Therefore, Mora teaches getting documents approved where the documents are at different levels.

Applicant argues that the approval hierarchy level never changes. However, in figure 3, Mora demonstrates the existence of at least two levels, a high-level and a division-level. Since the high and division levels are two different levels, there do in fact exist a plurality of levels.

Applicant argues Mora does not teach that a notice is forwarded upon approval of one electronic document. However, Mora does teach a "programming for a display that prompts a user to enter a request for signatures for a document and that generates a signature request document in response to said request for approval" (column 59, lines 41 - 45), where the form is an "automated and controlled signature form for required signoff", (column 21, lines 17 -18). Mora does in fact teach automation that allows a signature form to be forwarded and also teaches the generation of a signature request form in response to a request for approval.